

Serial No.: 10/603.408
Docket No.: 60655.1000

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**REMARKS**

Applicant hereby replies to the Office Action dated November 2, 2005, within the shortened statutory three month period for reply. Claims 1-11 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1-11. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejects claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner asserts that "[t]he claim(s) contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention" (page 2, item 3). In regard to the claim limitation of "using only a single translation", the Examiner asserts that the "specification does not contain any description of how this is performed" (page 2, item 3). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Applicant asserts that the specification clearly discloses a translation process. MPEP 2163(I)(R) states that, "[w]hile there is no *in haec verba* requirement, newly added claim limitations must be supported in the specification through express, implicit, or inherent disclosure." Because the specification does not disclose more than one translation, the limitation of "using only a single translation" is an inherent disclosure. Specifically, the specification discloses that, "[a]ll or a portion of the fields of the record are then fully or partially translated, following all or a portion of the directions in the interface File Definition (step 506)," (paragraph 60, second sentence). There is no disclosure of a secondary translation process. Furthermore, the Examiner is directed to Fig. 5, step 506 of the drawings which also discloses a single translation step.

Claims 2-11 variously depend from claim 1 and thus the enabled subject matter is incorporated into claims 2-11.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner next rejects claims 1-6 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Coleman, U.S. Patent 5,708,825 ("Coleman"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Coleman generally discloses a system for converting data between disparate systems in order to make data usable to a receiving computing system. The Coleman converter performs a

AXP Docket No. TH200312446

Serial No.: 10/603,408
Docket No.: 60655.1000

series of steps used to map data from one database to another. The Coleman system includes a hardware independent conversion engine that converts data from a first database to a platform neutral data type (first translation), then converts the platform neutral format to a format suitable to a second database (second translation). This dual translation process is clearly disclosed by Coleman as follows:

"The [data conversion language engine] DCLE of the present invention converts data from any number of different types or formats from any of various platforms to a single common data standard having a pre-defined generic data type, and the data is then converted from this generic type to a new desired format or type" (column 2, lines 48-53).

Coleman discloses a "generic data type" which is a required mid-step to perform the translation of data from a first format to a second format. Further, Coleman discloses an input data file and an output data file (column 3, lines 24-41). The Coleman system requires a user to first create the input data file that comprises a map of an input source to define how the DCLE engine should read data from the source. The user then creates an output data file to define the mapping of the destination. The DCLE engine then; (1) reads the input data file, (2) collects data from the source in accordance with the input data file, (3) converts the data into a pre-defined generic format (first translation), (4) reads the output data file, and finally (5) converts the generically formatted data in accordance with the output data file (second translation).

Accordingly, Coleman requires the use of not only generically-formatted data, but Coleman also requires the use of two translations. Coleman cites several reasons for including two translations and the intermediary step of formatting data from a first data repository to a pre-defined generic format. However, those skilled in the art would appreciate that simplified processes which include as few steps as possible are preferable for a number of reasons including, for example, reducing processing time and reducing the lines of programming code, which reduces error probability and is easier to maintain. While the five-step formatting process as disclosed by Coleman may be advantageous under certain circumstances, it would not prove to be the most efficient when there is a need to simply format data from a source in accordance with the requirements of a destination. As such, Coleman does not disclose or suggest at least "translating, via said host computer, using only a single translation of said data from said first

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 10/603,408
Docket No.: 60655.1000

source according to said definitions contained in said interface file," as recited by independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

Claims 2-6 and 8-11 variously depend from independent claim 1, therefore dependent claims 2-6 and 8-11 are differentiated from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner next rejects claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman in view of the Free On-Line Dictionary of Computing definition of the term "wizard". Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1, therefore dependent claim 7 is differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of its own respective features.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. Applicant invites the Office to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Howard Sobelman
Reg. No. 39,038

Dated: January 24, 2006

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com

AXP Docket No. TH200312446
1774024.3

7

BEST AVAILABLE COPY